Tapes: 015, 016

Interview with Ed Evatz

Conducted by Bob Stewart

December 31, 1987

***Disclaimer**: The Bureau of Land Management Library does not verify the accuracy of the accounts by participants in the Oral History Project. Individual stories are voluntarily submitted and are placed in the Library's permanent collection. These histories are the personal recollections and perspectives of participating individuals and are not intended as a substitute for an official record of the federal government. Transcripts have not been edited and may contain errors.*

INTERVIEW WITH ED EVATZ

[Conducted on December 31, 1987, by Bob Stewart]

BOB: Ed Evatz. Ed retired as Deputy State Director of the Division of Resources in the Bureau of Land Management in Reno, Nevada, Nevada State Office. The date today is December 31, New Year's Eve, 1987. Ed, you grew up in Carbon County, Utah, where carbon is king and graduated from Utah State University in 1941 in forestry.

ED: ’51.

BOB: I'm sorry, 1951. Didn't mean to add ten years to you. You grew up in Carbon country and yet you went into forestry. What led to that decision?

ED: Well, growing up in the coal camps, I was convinced that I didn't want a career as a coal miner. And I always did like the out of doors and was always impressed with the image of being a forest ranger. That's the main thing I had in my mind as I was growing up was someday that I would be a forest ranger for the Forest Service.

BOB: To reach a little bit for a pun, you graduated and went back to Carbon as a smoke jumper.

ED: I went.

BOB: Carbonization process of fire. I'm sorry, that's a lousy pun I was reaching for.

ED: I'm a little slow today, Bob.

BOB: Anyway, you went into smoke jumping with the Forest Service.

ED: Right.

BOB: You jumped on a lot of fires?

ED: Oh, just about 7 or 8 fires during the summer of 1951 after graduation. There were a lot of veterans out of school at that time and permanent jobs with the Forest Service or any natural resource agency were hard to come by at that time. So, it was an opportunity to do the kind of work I liked to do and went to Missoula and did smoke jumping for the summer. After the fire season, went to work on the Flat Head National Forest. And then got called into the service during the Korean Conflict, was stationed in Alaska for most of my tour of duty.

BOB: You jumped out of what kind of plans, Ed?

ED: Oh, a combination of planes but the one that stands out the most is the old Ford Tri Motor.

BOB: Is that out the side or out the back?

ED: Out the side, out the side. And it was an exciting airplane.

BOB: You came back from service up in Alaska during the Korean Conflict and went back home to Carbon County?

ED: Went home to Carbon County, put my name into the Forest Service again for a job. Worked in the coal mines until I got a call to report to the Targhee National Forest out of St. Anthony, Idaho, and worked up in that country, West Yellowstone, Montana, and in the spring when I was offered a permanent position in the Atlanta Region, I opted to shop around and was told about the BLM and the O&C in Oregon. So, I wrote to them and was accepted for a forester position in Eugene, Oregon, and reported there the fourth of May 1954.

BOB: The O&C lands had really not been around all that long at that point as a management function of the Bureau of Land Management [BLM]. Obviously, the forests had been there, but.

ED: Well, the historian may prove me wrong. I think the O&C Act was passed around 1937. And BLM organized the old Grazing Service and O&C and came to be about 1948 as I recall. So, at that time, we were BLM but there was a definite delineation between whether you were O&C or whether you were public domain as far as BLM was concerned. O&C was really where the action was as far as the forestry program going.

BOB: Lot of timber sales? Lot of.

ED: Lot of timber, yeah. The allowable cut at that time as I recall in the O&C was close to a billion board feet a year. And it was several years later that Washington started looking at the public domain forestry program and as a source of getting things going in the public domain, they were recruiting foresters from the O&C to get the programs going. And I was contacted by Frank {***Kermersky***} who was the State Forester in Colorado that worked with him in Eugene and Frank asked me to go to Craig, Colorado. Coming from the Rocky Mountains and not particularly liking to cruise timber and lay out sales when it's raining a good deal of the time, I jumped at the change and the challenge of getting a forestry program going in the Rocky Mountains. And we did. I think we showed the Forest Service a few things about timber production in public domain.

BOB: Ed, what kind of stands of timber did you have in the Craig District?

ED: Most of the timber was lodge pole pine and some spruce, but in the ’40's the spruce budworm infestation killed a lot of timber in the combination of the Craig and the old Denver District, particularly on the Forest Service lands, on the White River National Forest.

BOB: So, it had been climax forest and it had reverted because.

ED: Yeah. There was a lot of Englemann spruce killed but it also killed a lot of the lodge pole pines. And the challenge was selling salvage timber. And we did. The first 2 years I was in Craig, we put up 3 and 1/2 million feet of lodgepole pine salvaged timber which was more than the Forest Service had sold up to that time.

BOB: Had there been sawmills in the area?

ED: There was a sawmill about 10 miles from the first timber sale area that we had on King Mountain.

BOB: So there had been Forest Service timber program there.

ED: Oh, yeah. There had been sales. There were big mills in Kremmling. The mill at Toponas, Colorado, which we sold to, was a small mill, but it was a steady, you know, producing mill. And then there were mills, you know, on the East Slope that you'd like lodgepole pines for transmission line poles. Copper industry, which you've probably heard of, and in northern Colorado, in the north part, there was a big mill.

BOB: Did this become the first PD forestry of the Bureau or was it also occurring elsewhere?

ED: The Canon City District and the Montrose District had some programs going to.

BOB: So, it was in Colorado that the basic policies had to be developed for PD forestry?

ED: I like to think so, but you know, Montana also had their forestry program. We just took off in Colorado with kind of a new program and it was exciting. And, of course, with any new program when you have the old programs like the range program and the

watershed program which were really what public domain was all about, grazing administration, it was interesting to break in with and get accepted by some of the old range cons or those kinds of people. We did it, though. We had a good organization.

BOB: From Craig, you went to?

ED: From Craig, I went to Grand Junction, Colorado.

BOB: Still with the forestry?

ED: With forestry but starting to assume range functions because I could see that if I was going to move anywhere ahead in the public domain, I better know something about the range program. So, I went to Grand Junction and handled the Range Program in one or two units and the forestry program and the fire program. I had responsibility for the fire program. At that time, it just seemed like we had more to do with less people. So, we didn't have to jump through all the hoops we jumped through with, after NEPA [National Environmental Protection Act] was passed, you know.

BOB: Okay, moving from there then?

ED: Moving from there to Durango, Colorado.

BOB: So, you're bouncing all over Colorado. Not really too far from home, just kind across the way from home.

ED: In Durango, then, I was the Assistant District Manager what they called at that time Range Manager.

BOB: Chief of Resources today.

ED: Pretty close, yeah. Headed up the range program and worked with Dick Kerr who was the District Manager at that time. And

incidentally, in Craig my boss was Bill **{***Malincy***}** who was my neighbor in Carbon County or least we came from Carbon County, both of us.

BOB: Is that when you left there and went to Washington?

ED: No, while I was in Durango, the job corps program was initiated, nationally. And I really had a desire to get involved in that program. It was, it sounded like an exciting thing to be working with young men in a conservation-oriented program. I had, you know, visions of what could be accomplished similar to the old CCC [Civilian Conservation Corps] Program which was very popular just before World War II. And we had to go through quite an interview process to get screened out for job corps.

BOB: That was very high profile. President Johnson was following it personally and had a lot of.

ED: Right. I ended up with a personal interview with Sergeant Shriver who was the one who put the stamp of approval on all the first Job Corps Camp Directors.

BOB: And that was what you became?

ED: And that's what I became. Back in my old stomping grounds in Carbon County and the thing that was oh, I guess, somewhat of a disappointment was that the way the Interior Department and BLM embraced the Jobs Corps Program but when the Nixon administration came in, and the administration changed including Directors of BLM, it was like getting rid of a disease. It just wasn't a popular program anymore. So, the guys that had really spent several years in the Jobs Corps Program with the idea that this would pay off really found themselves more of a liability because they had lost those years that they were in the Job Corps Program in terms of being in the regular BLM Programs.

BOB: That was the place where you met Mike O'Callahan {O'Callaghan?}?

ED: Right. Mike O'Callahan {O'Callaghan?} was the Senior Job Corps Administrator out of Washington, DC. And I might add, a very good one. And as a result of talking to Mike, I did go on a detail with OEO for 2 years working as a District Field Supervisor covering Job Corps Camps in the Rocky Mountain area, in Nebraska.

BOB: While you were Camp Director and because of your knowledge of the Bureau, were you able to pull together any projects on the public land that you're really proud of or were they just more routine jobs?

ED: Yeah, I think we had the best Job Corps Camp in the country, Forest Service, BLM included. We did a lot of good work. {***__Loren Welter__***} was the District Manager in the Price District and he and I worked very closely. R.D. Nielson was the State Supervisor at that time, State Director, and we built a lot of fences, we put in recreational sites. The Cleveland Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry was and is one of BLM's outstanding recreation areas in Utah. We just, we did a lot of good conservation work. More important than that, we did help some young kids.

BOB: But Nixon became President and you left?

ED: When Nixon became President, you know, one of his campaign promises was to get rid of the Job Corps Program. And though he didn't get rid of it, it was scaled down drastically. About that time, I got a call from Joe Fellini who was State Director in Idaho and he said, Ed, I'd like you to come to Boise. And I'd been out of BLM a couple of years and so, didn't know which way the job corps program was going, so I accepted the job which at that time was Assistant to the State Director. But it was more the kind of job that you have now handling the public relations. I worked very closely with Joe Fellini and later Bill Matthews who came in as State Director. And I'd been associated with those guys some in the Range Program earlier. Boise was a good assignment. And from there I went to Washington.

BOB: That's what I thought. In Washington, you were on which staff?

ED: Washington, DC, I was on the range staff as Assistant Division Chief for Range. And worked with George Lee, first was the Chief, and then Kay Wilkes came in and worked closely with Kay who I thought was probably one of the best people BLM had in any management position. Kay was really good.

BOB: We're up now to a time where the American public's beginning to be aware of the environment and beginning to look at legislation like NEPA, the Wilderness Act, the Wild Horse, Wild and Free Roaming Horse and Burro Act. What kind of an atmosphere was there in Washington while that type legislation was moving in?

ED: Okay. NEPA was passed in late 1969. I was in Idaho with Joe Fellini at that time. And then, of course, shortly after, moved to Washington. The big. It was, you know, a big push toward environmental concern and the Wild Horse Act, of course, was passed while I was in Washington. And we also had a lot of meetings with Congressional leaders on what was later going to be the FLPMA. But there just was definite handwriting on the wall that we were going to be.

BOB: What was your feeling about the, what's your feeling now about how the Bureau reacted to that? Did we welcome it? Did we resent the outside interest?

ED: Well, you have to keep in mind that BLM has always been very politically oriented and the influence of the livestock industry particularly in Nevada, but not only Nevada, always had some bearing on the kinds of decisions that are made out of Washington. So, and I'm not saying that the livestock industry is anti-conservation. I'm just saying that their ideas on how things should be done doesn't always jive with some of the professional opinions or ideas of people who were trained in resource management. And I would say a lot of, you know, we had a lot of professionals who wanted to see some improvements in the way we manage the public lands but became frustrated at times because they couldn't move these programs along as fast as they'd like to move them. And, you know, it's one thing to see things that have to be done, but you also have to consider sometimes how that's going to affect the people that are being

impacted. I guess, to get back to your question, yes, there was a philosophy of needed change but there was also the practical aspect of, you know, you don't turn things upside down over night. And as a result, today I still think what are we, 15 years or better after NEPA, that still a lot of things out there that could be done. I think we're working in that direction as an agency, but maybe not at the pace that some of our professionals would like to move. And I was probably in the category of some of those who felt we ought to move a little faster than we did.

BOB: Let's break.

BOB: You were in Washington, then, in the early 1970's, the period where the Federal Land Policy and Management Act was being developed. Possibly you were there for the beginning of the {***DeConcini***} [Teno Roncalio?] Rangeland Improvement Act. But let's look at FLPMA [Federal Land Policy and Management Act] for a moment, the BLM's organic act. Did you work personally with Congress, with staff? What were the relationships that were involved in development of the wording of that law?

ED: Well, as you know, FLPMA was under consideration for quite a long time and we would be called on, particularly in the Range Division, because it seemed like that was the pretty popular program that was being addressed in deliberations with FLPMA. We would be called up to meet with Congressional staff, iron things out, work on languages, and occasionally, a Senator or Representative would participate in the discussion. A lot of these meetings were jointly with the Forest Service who had a role in FLPMA legislation. So, the fellows up front like Turcott, particularly Turcott, would call the Division Chief and we would get prepared to brief the Congressional people. Go up on the Hill and discuss language and then we would get drafts to review.

BOB: So, it was a cooperative effort, not an adversary situation?

ED: Well, it was a cooperative in terms of we would provide them the information and give them our ideas like on the Wild Horse Act. There were a lot of discussions on that legislation. Unfortunately, I think, the emotion involved on the Wild Horse Program took away

some of the realistic management objectives. And therefore, we came up with legislation that a lot of us didn't like, even though we supported protection of wild horses. It was just almost the kind of program that you couldn't work with in terms of the law.

BOB: Are there any parts of FLPMA that you particularly remember as being difficult to work out with Congress?

ED: I, overall, I think FLPMA is a good law. I think we did a good job in working with Congress on that. And I feel that overall, the Bureau did get some, the organic act they didn't need it to base programs on, management program. I could go down with that, you know, not having reviewed.

TAPE WENT BLANK.

BOB: Minor technical difficulty there. Ed, we were talking about your Washington years and your Congressional relationships. One of the stories that George Turcott told when I interviewed George and that's been a long while back now. But one of the stories he told was about wilderness and how it became to be in FLPMA. Were you involved in any of the specific things or any comments along that, on FLPMA?

ED: Mainly, my discussion with Congressional staff on FLPMA pertained to the range and wild horse aspect of the law. The allotment management plans, the Grazing Advisory Board, the multiple use Advisory Boards, the Wild Horse Act revisions and that sort of thing. But, where George would be across the board in his role as Deputy Director, my functions were more of the oriented to the range program which was very much in the limelight at that time because of the environmental concerns.

BOB: You were active for a number of years in the implementation of FLPMA as a Chief of Resources, Deputy State Director for Resources in Nevada. You were involved in implementation of a lot of it on the ground. Now, you're a consultant working on the outside. Are you pleased? Has it worked well looking at it from the outside now?

ED: Well, there are a few things in FLPMA that as a consultant I have some concerns about. But not only as a consultant, as a professional land manager. I'm sure BLMers had the same concerns. Probably the biggest one relates to the Wilderness Program. And the fact that we did a very intensive inventory on potential wilderness areas. We threw some out as part of the program and procedure. But those that remained as Wilderness Study Areas unfortunately, this was not a consistent kind of program throughout the Bureau. For example, working on a transmission line project through part of California in Bishop and although the planning had set up corridors for transmission lines, the BLM set Wilderness Study Areas up in such a way that it was impossible to put another transmission line through.

TAPE ENDED.

ED: It's going to be recommended eventually to be taken out and not included as a Wilderness Area. It stays under the kind of management, interim management, as wilderness until Congress eventually acts to remove that area. So, you have a number of areas with hundreds of thousands of acres of land that have been recommended by BLM to be taken out of wilderness study but yet other programs can't move forward because of that. I think that's just terrible in terms of exploration development for mining or other lands type programs for improvement programs on the public lands. It's just not good.

BOB: Ed, about 1973, you were part of a group out of Washington that did some evaluation of program in Nevada or in the West?

ED: As part of the Bureau's Evaluation Program, or periodic evaluations made in the different States. Some are resource evaluations, some are management evaluations. This one that particularly remembered in my mind is when we came out to Nevada to look at the resource program and I'll be real frank about this trip that we took. There were wildlife representatives, recreation, lands, minerals, myself covering the range program. We covered the Battle Mountain District in particular I remember going from Battle Mountain to Ely and it seemed like most of my week was listening to the rest of the evaluation team criticize the range program. Whether these cows, we'd be driving along the road and cows out.

Obviously, overgrazed area. And I was getting the brunt of the feeling particularly from the wildlife people who I felt in Washington, their program consisted of knocking down the Range Program. So, as a result of the evaluation, we made a recommendation that there be a follow-up in-depth look at the grazing program in Nevada. And this was accepted by the Director, Curt Berklund, at the time, and George Turcott. And as a result of that, the team did come out to Nevada and eventually we received the Nevada Report. Now, I was in Washington. I wasn't part of the team that put together the Nevada Report. In fact, Kay Wilkes and I had some problems with the contents of the draft Nevada Report. Particularly because it focused on individual permittees. And we, I remember meetings with Mr. Turcott who agreed with our position and going upstairs within the Interior Department, meeting with Interior Department Solicitors and we were overruled on the way we felt that the report should be worded. It came out as a draft report and immediately **TAPE BLURRED**. Having zeroed in on individuals, I think we'd lost a lot of what the report was supposed to accomplish because it got caught up in the individual aspects of what was wrong. And some of the ranchers who had really tried to work with BLM in some programs were, I think, unfairly targeted in the report.

BOB: You said the draft report became public or it?

ED: The draft report became public.

BOB: Did it become the final report or was it as it were leaked?

ED: As a final report came, it had taken some of those things out that we had objected to earlier. Our argument that it shouldn't be released as a draft and unfortunately, it was.

BOB: Formally or was it leaked?

ED: Well, I'm sure it was leaked at first. But based on the leak, there was a demand that it be seen by some of the environmental groups. And it was just a bad situation. If we would've had time to really work with that draft and come out with more of a positive

evaluation report, I think it would have been better. But we went with the Nevada Report then and that's about the time I came to Nevada and.

BOB: So, now you're on the other side. Now you're implementing the report.

ED: We're implementing the report and we had very intensive meetings with the State Director, the District Managers.

BOB: What year are we up to now?

ED: We're talking 1975.

BOB: Okay. So, FLPMA is not yet passed.

ED: FLPMA is not yet passed, but you didn't need FLPMA because you had the Taylor Grazing Act that, you know, preambles that you will protect the resources or words to that effect. It's no secret that we needed improvements in range management in Nevada. But also, to just whitewash, not whitewash, but call everyone in ranching, you know, as exploiters of the resources. This wasn't good. And that's really what the Nevada Report did. But we tried working with the Districts to come up with a program called the Nevada Policy of how we would approach the Grazing Administration in Nevada. And I worked very closely with the State Director and the range staff, Darren Long was the State Range Conservationist. And the Branch Chief at that time was Hugh Harper. And we put together what would be a pretty tough program in terms of probably the most important one was we had to give the range some rest sometime during the year. If we were not on allotment management plans that provided restoration grazing in some way we had to get the range resource in a condition that we weren't going to have animals out there twelve months of the year with, you know, season-long use and no relief. And so that's the way we embarked on the program. And we went to Washington. Chet Connor, Ed {***Rollin***}, and myself. Chet was the District Manager in Winnemucca. And the big thing in that program was while we didn't have allotment management plans, we were going to have a minimum of 2 months rest on the range in the spring

of the year during that critical growing period.

BOB: Wasn't there also a slow water distance type?

ED: Oh, that's right. That was all cranked into area use, distance from water, unusable areas in terms of slope, this sort of thing. And then there were discussions about ephemeral ranges like in the Las Vegas District, you know, how you manage those. But we were really concentrating on those areas where you have substantial livestock operations and really a need to improve conditions of the resource.

BOB: Which Districts and obviously since you've named Chet Connor at Winnemucca.

ED: Yeah, Winnemucca unfortunately was the one that had identified users in the draft report. And Chet had to face, you know, this kind of environment in terms of animosity and that sort of thing. But we stuck with the program in terms of launching it. Curt Berklund and Ed {***Rollin***} went to Elko. I remember meetings with the Nevada livestock people and as many as 400 ranchers and they hung tough in the need to move the program. And we just had a bitter battle going on with the livestock industry at that time. I remember reading in the Nevada Livestock Association Journal that they referred to the {***Rollin***} Evatz guillotine coming down on the livestock people.

BOB: That's a little tough.

ED: And, you know, these were ranchers who on an individual basis you discuss things and I'm not saying they agree with what you say, but you do have good dialogue. And they recognized the need for changes in some areas on some allotments. But when you're talking to a group of 400 people like Ed {***Rollin***} had to do, you know, that's a no-win situation. But anyway, we started to move out in that direction and then we get another change in Administration when President Carter came aboard, got a new Director.

BOB: Now we're talking Frank Greg?

ED: We're talking Frank Greg who was closely aligned with the environmental group. But at the same time, when you had a Director like Berklund who was very independent in terms of political pressure as opposed to Frank Greg who didn't have the base. It's almost paradoxical that the momentum changed toward being less effective in terms of management under Greg than we were under Berklund. Curt Berklund never backed off. On the other hand, Frank Greg politically wasn't as strong, and we started to lose the Nevada. About that time also, the Sagebrush Rebellion was coming on and all of this got caught up in that political mess. And we just lost a lot of what we'd worked so hard to accomplish. And the guys out in the field, you know, were and I'm sure still are trying to bring about some semblance of that Nevada policy and program. But definitely, the momentum was lost.

BOB: You've as it were separated the Sagebrush Rebellion from the Nevada Report. What did bring on the Sagebrush Rebellion? You didn't separate it totally, I realize that.

ED: Well, I'm sure the main thing that brought about the Sagebrush Rebellion was just the simple fact that so much public land as compared to private land. You remember the badges that said, 13 percent isn't enough. They were worn around by state legislators. And there was just the issue on water rights was another thing that ranchers and others felt that they were losing everything to the feds. And, you know, I'm sure if you're out there as a private individual and you're frustrated with the government, things like the grazing program, water rights, the fact that you own very little land, it just picked up momentum. And the fact that you had a new Administration in now that represented an environmental movement, so to speak. Secretary Andrus, President Carter, and all, it just happened.

BOB: It just happened.

ED: Yeah.

BOB: What about some of these people. Ed, would you give me a kind of thumbnail description, capsule comment on them, as I give some names. You started out, one of your, one of the early people in your career was Joe Fellini, not our Joe Fellini, the rancher in Nevada, but the BLM's Joe Fellini.

ED: Joe was just a super guy. He was oriented, of course, toward, mainly toward the Grazing Program. Grew up on a ranch out of Mackey, Idaho, and I remember Joe telling me the story of how he started out with the government. He was working hay up there on the ranch and USGS was doing, or the Cadastral Survey was doing some work up in that area and come by to rent some horses from his Dad and his Dad said, 'can you use a kid, too?' So, that was his beginning of government service. Joe was very, you know, good in working with the ranchers and that's where the action was for so many years, was, you know, the Range Program was the Bureau program for so many years.

BOB: A name we hear again and again in BLM records is R.D. Neilson.

ED: R.D. Neilson was, I think, a very effective State Director. My first discussion with R.D. was when I was selected, not by him, but by the Washington Office as Job Corps Camp Director in Utah and he was State Director. I was at a State Advisory Board meeting in Denver and received a call from R.D. And anybody who know R.D. can appreciate the conversation. He called me and said, you've been selected by the Washington Office. In other words, not by me to be camp director in Price. I hope you're the man for the job. So, what do you say? I said, well, R.D. if I didn't think I was, I'd never put in for it. But when he said there's a meeting in Portland you're to go to. Mike O'Callahan [O'Callaghan?] was running the meeting but I want you to report to me on the way back and I did. R.D. always thought of himself as the top personnel manager. So, he proceeded to tell me who he thought I should staff or consider some of my staffing. And after a little knockdown, drag out, we went on from there and R.D. supported the Job Corps Program a hundred percent. He just, he's a very good many in my opinion.

BOB: How about J. Russell Penny?

ED: Well, J. Russell, of course, is one of the very enthusiastic managers in BLM. And I think was very instrumental in getting a lot of new programs going, you know, like the California Desert Program. And Russ just had that kind of momentum about him. I never worked directly for Russ. His style of management is not the kind of style that I preferred.

BOB: How about Ed **Rollin**?

ED: Ed **Rollin** was, I think you can see going through the Nevada program and the Nevada Report, Ed never backed off an inch in what Washington or he, himself, felt had to be done. Ed is probably, I guess, one of the best guys I've ever worked for. He doesn't talk much but he lets you run the program and he supported you. He didn't back off.

BOB: You already talked a little bit about Curt Berklund.

ED: Well, I have to put Curt in a class as all of the BLM Directors that I've known since I started back in 1954 and over 30 some years. Curt Berklund was the one Director who was his own person. You know, we've had good men as Directors, but I think all of them were affected more by the political atmosphere than Curt Berklund was. He just, to my way of thinking, was the best leader that I'd run across in BLM.

BOB: Ed, 30 years with the Bureau. What kind of changes in direction, what? It's developed a long way in that 30 years. Has it developed well in your mind? Are you pleased with what you see today as you look at the Bureau and as you as a consultant work with the Bureau?

ED: Well, the Bureau is just like any other company in a lot of ways. There are a lot of good people who have really worked hard in the Bureau to accomplish programs and then there are those who are going to be around forever regardless of whether they produce or not. The fact that the Bureau has taken on more of a multiple use orientation, you know, it's good. The thing that, I guess, I would have to criticize the Bureau for more than any other thing is

there never really was a personnel management program. You happen to be in a certain place at a certain time. You have a sponsor. Like you're in budget program in Washington, you're chances of coming out into management positions that are probably better than if you're in another program. Well, this is okay except that there's no design for that so that people can opt to move into these different programs. And so, the people who seem to have a little more influence than others really dictate the personnel management program. There doesn't seem to be a something that a young guy or gal can come in and say, hey, I'd kind of like to head in this direction. And, you know, you do it as an individual and that's what I did and that's what a lot of others do. But it's kind of perhaps and chance. Like I get a call from Joe Fellini that says, you know, come to Idaho out of the clear blue sky. Or, you know, would you come here? And other people are putting in for jobs and, you know, it just seemed like. What really disturbed me about my tenure when the Bureau was really building up after NEPA was that there seemed to be more interest by a lot of our employees of where, how fast they could move ahead. And by managers in different programs of how big a staff they could build up rather than really looking at the need and leaving some tracks on accomplishments to show that you were, you know, heading in a certain direction. That's my observations. I'm sure that many won't share that.

BOB: The Bureau expanded after NEPA. Then it went into a contraction period based on the whole federal budget and how people looked at the budget. What is your crystal ball tell you down the road?

ED: Well, my crystal ball tells me that just like everybody else seems to be concerned about. This country needs to take a look at, you know, deficits and I think as far as the BLM is concerned, you know, we ought to look at our own shop. It's, you know, the bureaucracy is just once it gets going, it's hard to do something about in terms of growing numbers. But I will say BLM, I think, has responded pretty well to recognizing the need to say we got to scale back in some areas. But I still think there has to be.

BOB: How about the land itself? How about the land itself? Grazing, do you see grazing continuing into the far distance future as a use of public lands?

ED: Oh, sure.

BOB: How about recreation use, expanding, becoming less?

ED: I see recreation in terms of disbursed recreation opportunities. Just casual use. With the exception of those areas, you know, really have a need for recreation facilities. I guess I don't see the recreation program expanding that much in like Nevada, for example. There's a lot of recreation out there now that people can go out and utilize the public lands without having to, you know, provide extensive facilities. The government just can't afford it.

BOB: How about the Wildlife Habitat Program that brings the hunters to Nevada.

ED: That program, the Wildlife Program, is, of course, intertwined with the Range Program. I think there's a direction, a momentum that's been started in like riparian management then recognize that it'll take years to accomplish, but I think we're going in that direction. And until we have riparian management.

BOB: Riparian management and livestock grazing seem to be a little bit head-to-head.

ED: Right. Well, let's face it. Your best grazing, the habitat or forage is usually where your riparian habitat is, not always, but, you know, there's obvious conflicts there. And until the grazing program can show some results through restoration or other types of management, there's going to be impacts to the riparian areas. There aren't any easy answers. But there's going to have to be some improvement livestock grazing management to accommodate the need for wildlife resources, in my opinion. There's so much land in Nevada that has the potential to really be excellent range with some management. And, hopefully, that's the direction they're headed.

BOB: You spent 30 years with the Bureau. A kid from Carbon County,

Utah, who went into timber, came to Nevada where even the Forest Service doesn't have timber east of the Sierra, and you've stayed here after you retired. You're working now as a consultant doing things with the public land. And a lot of it reacting to the policies and the planning that occurred while you were with the Bureau. Was it a good job? Is the planning process something that you now from the outside are able to work with very well?

TAPE ENDED.

BOB: Some things if you knew what was going to happen?

ED: That's a good question, Bob. Land use planning is a must. The effectiveness of the Bureau's Land Use Plan again are questionable in terms of politics, in terms of public reaction. As you know, the public is apathetic until something affects them directly. We go through a lot of expensive planning processes, and we try to get public input as we go through. But we may generate what looks to be a very good land use plan **TAPE WENT BLANK.** I would say and we put together a good-looking Land Use Plan and there's been a lot of work on it. But we want to. We get an application, say, for a transmission line and in my case, I'm very familiar with that subject. After the District had designated a corridor for a transmission line and another District has almost excluded all other areas in their land use planning but the one that we prefer to put the line. And then the public reacts because this line happens to be going within a half mile of where they live or something and the Bureau backs off. And tells the applicant, well, you got us to look somewhere else. And so, in those kinds of things, effectiveness of the land is planning, really questionable considering all the time that is gone into that. On the other hand, you have to say well, and again depending on the District, the fact that the District is flexible maybe you can get them to accept something that isn't in the plan. And so, it works both ways. But my experience with, from the outside looking, working with the Bureau is too many times some of the specialists get lost in the intricacies of their technical program within the overall plan and they won't accept the management decisions of that plan. So, you get caught up in that thing too in your planning, like a wildlife biologist may say, well, you can't do this because of this and this although the management decision overall allows you to do those things. It's like I say, planning is important, but you can't overlook the fact that regardless of your planning and this happens

in a city arena or anywhere else. There are certain plans that may be good plans on paper, but the economic situation, things like that, just aren't going to make an effective plan because there are going to be decisions that are going abort the plan.

BOB: If you had it all to select all over again, back there in May of 1952, May of ’54, would you have come to the O&C lands and started a career with the Bureau?

ED: Oh, that was a good decision. I was so close to Smokey Bear and the way I wanted to look at my future that I think it was the best thing that happened to go with the O&C. And, sure, you know, I look back and I say, well, I maybe could have been here or could have been there, but the Bureau overall has been good to me. And I particularly right now am enjoying the experience and opportunity that only the Bureau gave me. I have to thank the Bureau and people I've worked with and tell those young people out there that, you know, you got to, you can't get caught up in something that feels very important to you, and you lose your, you lose something in the way of a decision made by higher management. You just have to accept the fact that the Bureau operates a very complex land management program. And sometimes what you would like as an individual specialist may be foregone. But, you know, don't give up because some day you'll be up there making that decision and maybe you'll opt to go differently than management is opting to go now.

BOB: Ed Evatz, December 31st, 1987. Thank you very much Ed.